

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, Applicant has added new claim 16. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-13, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-7, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danneels et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,663,951, hereafter “Danneels”), in view of Ishibashi et al, (“A Synchronization Mechanism for Continuous Media in Multimedia Communication”, INFOCOM '95. Fourteenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Bringing Information to People. Proceedings. IEEE 2-6 April 1995 Page(s): 1010 - 1019 vol. 3, hereafter “Ishibashi”) and Miao (U. S. Patent No. 7,280,650)².

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danneels in view of Ishibashi and Miao, and further in view of Little et al. (“Network and Operating Systems Support for Digital Audio and Video: Proceedings, 5th International Workshop on Network and Operating Systems Support for Digital Audio and Video, Springer 1995”, hereafter “Little”).

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danneels in view of Ishibashi and Miao and further in view of Keshab et al. (“Digital Signal Processing for Multimedia systems”, CRC Press 1999, pg. 245 and 274, hereafter “Keshab”). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections.

² On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 1-7, 10, and 15 are rejected based on Danneels and Miao. However, the claims are actually rejected based on the combination of Danneels, Ishibashi, and Miao.

Independent claim 1 recites in part:

a video link (L2) between these connection means (ML1) and the video terminal (PC1) of the first pair,

an audio link (L1) between these connection means (ML1) and the audio terminal (TM1) of the first pair,

a video link (L3-2) between these connection means (ML1) and the second pair (TM2, PC2), and

an audio link (L3-1) between these connection means (ML1) and the second pair (TM2, PC2),

wherein the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay.

Applicant respectfully submits that, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references that “the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay”, as recited in independent claim 1. Although the Examiner asserts on page 3 of the Office Action that Danneels teaches the above-quoted element of the claim, the Examiner then acknowledges on page 4 of the Office Action that Danneels does not in fact teach that “the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay”, as claimed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Danneels does not synchronize audio and video data according to a delay. Danneels teaches that when data is transmitted from a local node to a remote node, a first subset of the data packets is transmitted to the remote node and then a subsequent subset of the packets is transmitted from the local node to the remote node after a delay in order to prevent the data packets from overloading the remote node (see column 1, lines 61-65 of Danneels). At best, Danneels delays a portion of the data packets that are to be

transmitted to a remote node. However, Danneels does not synchronize the data packets based on a delay.

With respect to Miao, Applicant respectfully submits that Miao does not teach or suggest “the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay”, as claimed.

Miao teaches that a conferencing server may determine a delay parameter for one or more streams of data. The conferencing server may attempt to synchronize the streams using the delay parameter, and may introduce a predetermined amount of delay into one or more of the streams to coincide with the delay of the other streams. Accordingly, Miao delays one stream of data to synchronize that stream of data with the delay of other streams of data. However, Miao does not teach or suggest that an audio stream and a video stream are synchronized according to a delay as claimed. In fact, Miao teaches synchronizing three streams of voice information (see column 7, lines 41-45 of Miao).

Since the transmission of audio packets are usually faster than the transmission of video packets, an exemplary embodiment of the present invention synchronizes the audio data and the video data by determining a transmission time difference between the audio and video data, and making up the time difference by delaying transmission of the audio data to the receiving audio communication terminal (see for example, pages 3-4 of the specification as filed). When the video data and audio data are transmitted to a receiving terminal, the video data is transmitted immediately (that is, without delay) to a transmission link, while the related audio data is stored in a buffer for a time equal to a calculated delay, and is then transmitted to the receiving terminal.

This differs from Miao, which teaches that all of the streams are delayed (see column 1, lines 56-64), and one stream is delayed in order to coincide with the delay of the other streams.

Miao also teaches synchronizing three streams of voice data according to a delay parameter (column 7, lines 41-60).

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the cited references - Danneels, Ishibashi, and Miao in view of their diverse teachings and their different objectives..

First, Ishibashi relates to the continuous synchronization of master streams and slave streams (Ishibashi does not indicate what the two data streams represent) by delaying the arrival of one of the streams. Ishibashi differs structurally from Danneels in that in the Ishibashi system the source comprises two or more terminals, and the destination comprises a single terminal, while in Danneels, the communication is between two single terminals. Accordingly, Danneels and Ishibashi do not complement each other.

Moreover, the two references teach away from each other in that Ishibashi teaches synchronizing the two data streams so that they arrive at the destination simultaneously (see section 3), while Danneels teaches delaying subsets of data packets so that they do not arrive at their destinations simultaneously (thus preventing overloading) (see column 1, lines 61-65 of Danneels). The references are directed to completely different objectives such that there is no reason to combine or modify their teachings in view of each other.

Further, Keshab and Little do not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Danneels, Ishibashi, and Miao.

Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references that “the video data is transmitted from one of the first video communication terminal and the second video communication terminal to a receiving terminal of one of the first video communication terminal and the second video communication terminal without delay, and the

audio data is delayed by a predetermined time before being transmitted to a receiving audio communication terminal”, as recited in new claim 16. Support for this subject matter can be found at least on page 10 of the specification as filed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 should be allowable because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claim. Claims 2-13 and 15 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 11, 2009